REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-13.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8 and 10-13 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chow et al. (US Patent No. 6,029,175).

The system of Chow is a revision manager for an electronic document management system using a cache to store documents. This is not a communication system as claimed in claim 1.

A community, as defined in the specification of this application is a collection of agents and a persistent store used such that the attributes of objects are not lost when those objects are inserted into the store. This persistent store is a Space, that also has a publish and subscribe capability. The community is not a network, as in Chow. See Applicants' specification at page 4, line 30 through page 5, line 3, for example.

The cache of Chow is not a Space. The cache of Chow does not perform the publish and subscribe service as the Space does. The Revision Manager of Chow is the entity performing the notification process and that is done only if the user selects it. As described on page 7, lines 13-18, as an example, the Space itself notifies agents (not users) of the insertion of an object of interest. It is an autonomous response of the Space, not a programmed response of a piece of software.

With regard to the agents, the revision manager is not a double agent. A double agent, as defined in the specification and required by amended claim 1, is an agent that communicates with a Space using one protocol and with an entity using a second protocol. The Revision Manager of Chow does not communicate with entities having different protocols, it is directed to determining if documents have been revised. There is no 'communication' between the Revision Manager and the cache, as the Revision Manager does not have to use any protocol to communicate with the cache, it just stores the data there.

Application No. 09/676,147   Page 6 of 8   Do. No. 2705-128

For these reasons, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 6 and 11, as amended, require that the Space being established have a publish and subscribe capability, and that a member of the community is in communication with a double agent that *generates* an object. The Revision Manager does not generate objects, it merely monitors documents for accesses indicating changes and then sends messages. These are not objects and they are not inserted into anything resembling a Space. With regard to claim 13, the amendments to the claim require that the notification be provided by the Space, which is not shown by Chow for the reasons discussed above.

It is therefore submitted that claims 6, 11 and 13 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

With regard to claims 2 and 4, as discussed above, Chow does not disclose a double agent that communicates using two different protocols, much less one that can communicate with any entity as a universal double agent, or one that can communicate using a second protocol specific to a particular device.

With regard to claim 3, Chow does not disclose a double agent that can adopt characteristics to communicate with any entity. The polling daemon 7 referred to in the office action is merely a process with one specific purpose. It cannot change its characteristics.

With regard to claims 8 and 12, Chow does not disclose a space, double agents or subscribed members, so Chow cannot show various combinations of where they reside.

It is therefore submitted that claims 2-4. 6, 8, 10 and 12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 5, 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow.

It would not have been obvious to modify the system as in Chow to include a determination agent, as Chow discloses no agents, spaces or objects. There is no mention in Chow of misplaced objects, or objects of any kind. The only items in Chow are documents and if they are misplaced, there is no provision to locate missing ones. The ability to transfer objects between spaces is not in response to misplaced documents, but in response to a member of the community looking for an entity that is tied to another space.

It is therefore submitted that claims 5, 7 and 9 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613